

**Tai, Allen**

---

**From:** LESK2PV@aol.com  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 19, 2007 4:48 AM  
**To:** Allen.Tai@sanjoseca.gov  
**Cc:** roma.dawson@sanjoseca.gov; Sam.Liccardo@sanjoseca.gov; steering@nagleepark.org; executive@nagleepark.org; LESK2PV@aol.com  
**Subject:** SJMC SAC Meeting Clarifications for Minutes  
**Attachments:** FinalAug2006BUL.pdf

Allen:

I just wanted to clarify a few points I made at the last meeting so they can be accurately reflected in the minutes.

- 1) I questioned the representative from Rudolph & Sletten with regard to how his analysis was undertaken and whether he reviewed any prior structural engineering reports or conducted any new analysis. He indicated familiarity with SB1953, the State hospital seismic upgrade mandate, but was not familiar with the HAZUS analysis process currently being implemented by OSHPD (Office of Statewide Health and Planning Department) to reassess seismic vulnerability for hospital buildings (see attached and please post on website). Rudolph & Sletten's assessment was based on a walk through of the buildings combined with their expertise in new hospital construction and common practices and features typically required for modern healthcare facilities. The representative from Rudolph & Sletten listed a number of deficiencies in the SJMC buildings relative to newly constructed healthcare facilities including ADA access. I asked if the buildings would be suitable for a clinic and also questioned how a building that was an operating hospital as recently as 2004 could possibly be significantly non-compliant with the multitude of issues raised in the Rudolf & Sletten report. [An analysis of the buildings from another structural engineering/general contracting firm hired by a potential clinic operator such as Gardner would be useful to gain another independent opinion (suggested at the prior SAC meeting). If the HAZUS process was applied to the SJMC site for reuse as a hospital, and the buildings reclassified to category SPC 1E, the date for compliance with seismic upgrade requirements would be pushed out at least 13 years to 2020.]
- 2) I related to the group a recent article in the Mercury News that stated "The city bought 75 acres of the former FMC plant in two transactions in 2005 and 2006, at a total cost of \$81.5 million. The city's long-term vision of the property has been to sell or lease it for industrial development. But the lack of a market for industrial land has led city officials to try to find what it calls interim uses for up to 30 years." The group then discussed the feasibility of considering the FMC site as a land banking location for a future hospital. I then asked for clarification of the process by which the City acquired this property and whether there were other downtown properties owned by the City or similar processes and resources that could be applied specifically to the already public/quasi-public zoned SJMC site. [Hopefully this will be fully vetted at a future meeting. The role of the Redevelopment Agency and funding sources and bonds for construction of public vs. private healthcare facilities was briefly discussed at the previous SAC meeting.]

Les Levitt

Campus Community Association Representative  
SJMC SAC

---

See what's free at [AOL.com](http://AOL.com).